

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 913

CG 011 150

AUTHOR Weinrach, Stephen G.
TITLE Outcome Research: Implications for Counseling in the Elementary School.
PUB DATE Oct 76
NOTE 82p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Affective Objectives; Behavioral Counseling; *Counseling; *Counseling Effectiveness; *Counselor Evaluation; Elementary Education; Elementary School Counseling; Guidance Objectives; Junior High Schools; *Program Evaluation; Research Design

ABSTRACT

Reviews of the literature suggest the need for research of outcomes of school counseling. This document attempts to speak to this problem. Section One reviews studies in methods of evaluating counselor behavior and counseling outcome. It proposes a counselor task survey which would involve counselors, parents, clients, and teachers in elementary schools in designing their own instruments to measure counselor effectiveness. Section Two describes specific methods by which valuing of counseling by students in a middle school can be produced and evaluated in behavioral terms. Section Three presents the results of a questionnaire study designed to determine the extent to which 325 students at a middle school displayed approach behavior towards their new counselor. The results showed that on most items a majority of students displayed approach behavior. (MPB)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED 134913

Outcome Research:
Implications for Counseling in the Elementary School

October, 1976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Dr. Stephen G. Weinrach
Department of Education
Villanova University
Villanova, PA 19085

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HARD COPY NOT AVAILABLE

CG011150

Contents

Section I Review of Outcome Research

Introduction.....	1
Review of the Literature.....	2
Clinical setting	4
Counselor-training setting	5
School setting	7
Conclusions	13
Recommendations for Suggested Action	16
Flow Chart	20
Relationship Inventory	21
Teacher Interaction Scale	22
Counselor Interaction Scale	23
Bibliography	24

Section II Valuing Counseling

Introduction	26
Objectives	29
Entering Behavior	31
Methods	33
Evaluation	44
Bibliography	46
Appendix	48

Section III Model Outcome Research Project

Introduction	53
Behavioral Objectives	55
Research Design	56
Analysis of Data - Total Population	57
Analysis of Data - Sub-population	66
Limitations of Design	68
Implications and Conclusions	69
Appendix	71

Section I
Review of Outcome
Research

INTRODUCTION

A review of the literature would indicate that there are three major professional settings for which evaluative and analytical tools have been devised. The first, which will be referred to very briefly in this paper deals with those techniques employed in the evaluation of counseling in a clinical setting. Because the hospital and clinic lend themselves to on going research, there has been much work done in this field. The Journal of Counseling Psychology and The Personnel and Guidance Journal feature articles in this area that relate to the outcome of various techniques as they apply to counseling.

The second setting where analytical techniques have been devised is the college counselor-training program. These techniques have been designed to assist supervisors in their work with potential counselors. Articles on this topic have been found in the Personnel and Guidance Journal and Counselor Education and Supervision.

The third, and probably least effectively researched area is the outcome of school counseling. Although the behavior of the counselor in training has been subjected to analysis, once he gains professional status, there appears to be few methods at identifying good counseling. Part of the problem is that whatever techniques for evaluation do exist, they are frequently cumbersome.

Furthermore, a delineation must be made between administrator satisfaction and counselor-educator satisfaction with a counselor's performance. Once a counselor is out in the field, he is generally more obligated to his present employer than to his previous college professor.

There is some research in the field of secondary school counseling outcome. However, at the present time, the literature is lacking in terms of elementary school counseling outcome. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, a journal which is only several years old, has made a serious attempt at filling this gap. ERIC has also collected some data in this area. The two main sources of information have been The School Counselor and The Personnel and Guidance Journal.

Review of the Literature

The entire concept of outcome research was investigated by Kelley, Smits, Leventhal and Rhodes (1970) as reported in The Journal of Counseling Psychology between the years 1964 and 1968. The authors felt there to be serious limitations inherent to the process of outcome research. The basic drawback was the inability to apply the scientific model which requires both a control and experimental group. We must be concerned with the ethical implications of withholding treatment from those who need it just so that we have a control group.

These authors, though, were primarily concerned with those techniques employed to evaluate outcome research in the

series of research studies which they evaluated. It was their contention that many of these studies used questionable statistical procedures.

...a design in which a single group is studied only once, subsequent to some agent or treatment presumed to cause change...such studies have such a total absence of control as to be almost no scientific value. (Campbell and Stanley, 1966)

In view of these findings, one must question the value of much of the outcome research that already exists. This certainly has implications for the future of research if by nothing else, imposing greater restrictions.

Arbuckle questions the entire method by which we traditionally evaluate counselor success. According to him, research in counseling must explore new methods of evaluation, some yet unknown at the present time. Although Arbuckle himself accepts the therapeutic model as appropriate to counseling, he nevertheless rejects the application of the scientific method to the systematic analysis of human behavior.

The first question has to do with the research methodology itself, which has pretty much tended to imitate the time-honored scientific practices as they are followed in the physical sciences and in medicine. ...In a somewhat curious contradiction, counselors insist on the uniqueness of the human individual, and yet, in their research they seem to find no difficulty in lumping him as one of many faceless members of a group. (Arbuckle, 1968)

Bergin suggested the following changes:

The best way to capitalize on the ferment and promise in this area is to foster clinical innovation, evaluation of practices, and a continuing ability to move toward the new and the valuable. If this means recasting the scientist-practitioner model in new terms of innovating practice

and physics-style research, so be it. The old model has done its job and now holds back the development of a more viable psychological profession. (Bergin, 1967)

Clinical Setting: Aubrey (1969) contended that the use of the therapeutic model originally devised for clinical use has been inappropriately applied to the school setting. He seriously questioned whether the techniques associated with the clinical model have much value when dealing with, in general, a normal population.

...close examination of the counseling literature reveals that its theoreticians and practitioners have done little to specify the conditions under which techniques should or should not be used, have failed to organize techniques and practices into a meaningful system, and are unable to predict what behavioral results will be produced by certain techniques. (Aubrey, 1969)

Both Arbuckle and Aubrey have agreed that different methods of evaluation must be employed. Aubrey concluded that the application of the therapeutic model as a technique in counseling is inappropriate for the school setting. Although there is an abundance of clinically oriented research available, its exploration would be inconsistent with the objectives of this paper. The following example, although of a clinical nature, has implications for future research in other professional settings as well.

Another avenue of evaluation, used by Schumacher (1967) employs the rating of counselors in a clinical setting by their professional peers. He found strikingly low inter-judge correlation. This is not to say that the technique, in theory, is

not of some potential value. According to Schumacher, the criteria for evaluation in his particular study were too vague. The question arises, though, whether in elementary schools where there is generally only one counselor, who would do the evaluating? Teacher and administrator bias would interfere with their completing such a task.

Counselor-training Setting: Counselor-educators in an attempt at providing better supervision for their students have developed several tools. One approach to the investigation of successful counseling skill is obviously asking the client. This technique was investigated in 1965 in a study by Linden, Stone and Shertzer. The authors were interested in testing the reliability and validity of the newly developed Counseling Evaluation Inventory. They correlated the responses of a randomly selected group of 700 counselors from throughout the United States and 386 randomly selected high school students who had been clients and seen by practicum students at Perdue University. The actual application of this instrument in their study was designed to predict practicum student success. The authors concluded:

In short, despite their brevity, all CEI factor scales and the CEI total score exhibited adequate reliability and at least limited discriminative validity for practicum grades. (Linden, Stone and Shertzer, 1965)

The Counselor Evaluation Inventory was the subject of another study, this one conducted by Haase and Miller (1968). They concluded that although the instrument was of value at both the college and high school level, a different emphasis had

to be placed on the scoring of the college students' inventories. The use of such an instrument may have some value in the elementary school program. Certainly, the concept is a viable one. One must consider, though, if the verbal and conceptual demands of any inventory of this nature are within the intellectual and emotional limits of small children.

As far back as 1960, Amidon and Flanders published Interaction Analysis in the Classroom. (see appendix) This is a device by which teachers may categorize their verbal behavior into seven categories and student responses into two. The tenth category deals with silence or confusion. The system is a good model for the systematic analysis of teacher interaction because it clearly identifies the wide range of teacher behavior in the classroom. Amidon (1965) adapted this system by changing the word "teacher," wherever it appeared, to "counselor." No other changes were made in terms of the classifications or definitions. One must consider how appropriate the application of the criteria for teacher interaction are to the counseling model. In any case, the concept is worthy of further consideration.

O'Hern and Arbuckle (1964) attempted to isolate those variables which separate effective counselors from ineffective counselors by developing an instrument which would measure counselor sensitivity. It consisted of a thirty minute tape recording with opportunities for the counselor to respond at

certain intervals. The instrument was specifically designed for use with counselors in training. The authors concluded that:

The final Sensitivity Scale may have some predictive value in that potential counselors who were judged most effective in counseling practice scored significantly higher in the Scale than those judged least effective. The potential usefulness of the Scale is at present unknown.

Although this instrument was designed for use in practicum settings, it is possible to administer such an instrument to those who are currently employed as counselors. Because this is somewhat like a test, it might be better to handle it as a self-evaluative technique rather than one imposed by a supervisor or employer. A combination of an adaptation of the Flanders/Amidon system and the Sensitivity Scale might produce some interesting results for counselors currently in the field.

School Setting: It would appear that The Personnel and Guidance Journal, The School Counselor and Elementary Guidance and Counseling feature more articles about the need for research in the field of outcome research than reports of actual research. Many such articles express the frustrations involved in performing the task. One theme that tends to tie together many of the articles is the inability of counselor-educators to agree on both the definition of the goals of school counseling and the methods by which to evaluate school counseling.

According to Lee's (1969) review of ten recently published textbooks in guidance and counseling there appears to be high agreement on the following five dimensions of evaluation:

1. Definition of the objectives of the program or activity to be evaluated.
2. Establishment of criteria against which progress toward these objectives can be measured.
3. Design of instruments and techniques by which this progress can be measured
4. Collection of data from all necessary sources
5. Analysis of data and judgment against criteria about the quality and quantity of the progress toward achievement of the stated objectives.

Lee pointed out that although these five dimensions appear in all ten texts, none of the authors has suggested a list of clear and evaluable objectives for guidance. The objectives and methods for evaluating attainment of said objectives must be clearly defined when the guidance program is actually initiated. Lee suggested two basic forms of evaluation: survey (questionnaire, interview, follow-up study) and experimental (measuring the differences between the two groups using academic data, test data, absenteeism, number of drop outs etc.) Although none of his particular methods is unique, it does seem logical that when a counseling program is being considered, clear and measurable goals should be enumerated at the onset. But what if one can't measure the goals ? If a goal is unmeasurable, it does not mean, necessarily, that it is not worthwhile.

A method which has received little scientific attention is that of self-evaluation, possibly because humans tend to be somewhat less than objective about their own behavior. This

particular method may make many a statistician cringe. It just might have some merit. Certainly, it is better than no evaluation at all.

The problem of determining who qualifies as the good counselor remains unsolved. Neither teachers nor students can effectively evaluate the counselors- a good counselor is the one who makes them feel as if they did it themselves. Administrators are in no better position to judge: The less they see or hear of the counselor, the more effective the counselors are being. Evaluation of a counselor's worth must therefore, be a self-evaluation, and if we see ourselves as agents of cohesiveness and if our actions are such that we provide that element in our interpersonal relationships, we can tolerate abuse; we can smile at time studies; and we can believe in ourselves and know that someday someone else will, too. (Siegel, 1969)

One must wonder whether Siegel would feel differently about evaluation if there were a consensus about the goals of counseling. But without stated goals, Siegel's approach to evaluation relieves much of the frustration associated with statistical design and implementation.

Schwartz and Ohlsen (1968) interviewed 152 students from a population of 1200 freshman high school students in Illinois. The intent of the study was to evaluate tape recorded interviews on the basis of content. The study was designed to distinguish between socially effective and socially ineffective students on the basis of student initiated topics of discussion. The authors concluded that: "Though this study failed to validate this technique for appraising outcomes of counseling, the investigators believe that it has promise sufficient for further research." One must consider

the possibility of analyzing counselor skill on the basis of systematic evaluation of a series of tape recorded interviews with various clients but keeping the counselor constant. Until we are able to define, in operational terms, what is counselor skill, it seems futile to try developing instruments to test it.

An investigation reported by Schmieding (1966) dealt with the academically failing junior high school student. In short, there were both experimental and control groups. All students were administered a battery of five tests before and after the experiment. Schmieding found that students who received professional counseling improved on three of the five criteria. Those items were (1) Grade point average, (2) Scores on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and (3) teacher ratings. Although this type of research complied with the requirement of having both control and experimental groups, the data reported shows no indication of control for Hawthorne Effect. Although there is evidence that those students who received professional counseling did improve, one must seriously question whether a party or other form of non-professional attention might have served as well.

Matthes, Kranzler and Mayer (1968) administered three instruments to elementary school children to determine whether client-centered counselor behavior was effective with children of this age group.

The instruments employed in this study were:

- (1) Relationship Inventory (Barrett-Lennard-1962)
(see appendix)
- (2) Michigan State Questionnaire (Flanders; 1965)
- (3) Sociometric Test (Gronlund; 1959)

The findings indicated that:

The only statistically significant correlation of coefficient was that between perceived counselor unconditionality of the regard and change in the students' sociometric status.

Of more importance than the findings of this study are the methods employed. The administration of paper and pencil tests of one sort or another is not new. We have seen examples earlier in this paper where the CEI was used. The authors of this study indicate that one of the limitations of their statistical design was the use of the Relationship Inventory. "It is also possible that elementary school students are unable to comprehend the meaning of the statements on the Relationship Inventory or to discriminate accurately between the possible answers on the Relationship Inventory." (Matthes, Kranzler and Mayer 1968) The conceptual and verbal limitations of paper and pencil tests are a drawback when working with young children. This particular limitation is one which educators and counselors should be able to overcome.

Knighten and Werner (1966), as reported in ERIC's Elementary School Guidance and Counseling (1968), also used the Relationship Inventory to test the effects of counseling upon interpersonal relationships, including those between students and teachers, teachers and administrators and teachers and

counselors.

The investigators concluded that counseling in the elementary school does make a difference although the results were not statistically significant. It is suggested that further study be done on what the actual relationships were and what elements of the treatment affected them.

There is of course some question whether counseling in the elementary school makes a difference and if the difference is a positive one. Probably the most interesting and disturbing article reviewed for this paper is Kranzler's (1968) entitled, "Elementary School Counseling: An Evaluation. " In a representative and thorough review of outcome research spanning the years 1963- to 1967 and dealing with counseling in the elementary school, Kranzler finds three rather conflicting conclusions. The results of his review of the literature only point up the need for more diverse, original, systematic and thorough methods for both counseling in the elementary school and evaluating such counseling.

The evidence provided by these studies does not permit the conclusion that there were differences between the children who were counseled and those who were not.

Three possible conclusions were discussed: (1) Counseling is effective, or at least was not proven ineffective, but the methods of counseling were inadequate in some respect; (2) The methods of evaluating counseling were adequate in these studies; therefore counseling or at least client-centered counseling, is a useless activity; and (3) Counseling affects children for better or worse.

Kranzler's findings are supported by other researchers (Kelley et.al, 1970; Arbuckle, 1968) in that there seems to be serious limitations on the methods and procedures that have been applied to the testing of outcome. We must come to grips

with this dilemma. Van Hoose (1968) is not so pessimistic.

The total guidance movement in this country is relatively new and at the elementary level the arrival of counselors in the school is such a recent event that many of the research deficiencies noted...are not surprising. Obviously some solid rationale should precede the inauguration of any program. It does not follow, however, that the theoretical rationale must be developed exclusively by those in the field. Neither is it always practical or sensible to wait for universal agreement on theoretical foundations.

CONCLUSIONS

In this paper various methods of evaluation and analysis of counselor behavior and counseling outcome have been explored. The opinions and ideas of several authors who have criticized and made suggestions for the improvement of the methods used for such evaluation and analysis have been cited. Researchers have done everything from interview and submit the client to various tests; to having counselors rate each other, analyze their own professional behavior and have clients evaluate counselors. No single method has emerged that is appropriate to every counseling setting. No single method appears to provide both a qualitative and quantitative analysis of counselor skill, muchless a universal rationale to justify the existence of counselors in the first place.

The strongest criticism which has been leveled against outcome research procedures employed to date seems to be that of the inadequate application of appropriate statistical designs. Furthermore, there is a serious lack of follow-up studies on

previous research despite the requests of the original authors to carry on their studies and find additional hard data. Logic would indicate that it would be both more economical and efficient to rework some of the data that already exists than start all over again each time someone wants to see his name in print. If some of the loopholes which appear in existing research studies were closed, we might have more hard data than we presently do. There is good reason to believe that poorly designed studies continue to proliferate. The application of newly found statistical methods and computer technology should facilitate the reevaluation of earlier studies. It would seem as though we haven't learned our lessons from history.

Another limitation, at the present time, is the application of the scientific model to the analysis of human behavior. There is serious doubt as to whether this model fits the subject matter we are trying to explore. One would hope that further inquiry into this area will provide the answer. If Kelley, et.al. (1970) are correct, more attention should be given to the methods by which we obtain and evaluate data. Questionable data is of questionable worth.

Stefflre (Van Hoose 1968) lists six areas which he felt are in need of research:

1. Agreement upon the terms used in guidance. Presently there is considerable confusion about the meaning of such terms as counseling, casework, consultation and others.

2. More attention should be given to studying the process of guidance activity rather than its ultimate ends.
3. There is a need to temper our reliance upon quantified sciences alone for our knowledge.
4. Research in guidance needs to be pertinent not just to satisfy our whims.
5. There is a greater need for more conceptualization in the guidance area.
6. Demonstration projects could be helpful in showing the value of specific types of guidance activities.

The relative scarcity of research in the field of elementary school guidance and counseling is probably a function of the small percentage of schools with such counselors. Although this is changing, at the present time, the field is a prime target for some imaginative research. Some studies which have been originally designed for use in the secondary school setting might well be adapted for use in the elementary school. One of the limitations of some of the studies already conducted is the reading and conceptual level of the instruments employed. It is essential that the instrumentation be developed in accordance with the students' achievement levels. Furthermore, one cannot, under any circumstances, assume that the model for counseling in the secondary school is synonymous with that of the elementary school.

Before elementary school counseling and guidance become fully integrated into the schools, it will be necessary for the profession to define its goals. These goals will vary

from setting to setting. Nevertheless, before counseling outcome can be effectively and economically evaluated, counseling goals must be clearly defined in behavioral and conceptual terms. And when that task is completed, we may begin to explore the numerous alternatives and limitations of evaluation.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SUGGESTED ACTION

It is possible, however, that it will be some time before we are capable of either defining our goals in behavioral terms or designing sound statistical methods for measuring such goals. Does this mean that counseling at the elementary school level should grind to a halt because we lack the technology or sophistication to define and evaluate ? I think not.

It is my feeling that the use of any single index to evaluate such a complex relationship as counseling in the elementary school is naive. The counselor in this setting doesn't just see clients. Evaluation of his interaction with students alone is a rather myopic view of his total function. Elementary counselors work closely with both teachers and parents, more so, for example, than do their counterparts in other academic settings. Certainly the elementary counselor would have more contact with a classroom teacher and a parent than a college counselor whose client is having academic difficulties. Using the counselor-teacher or counselor-parent interaction as a criterion is equally naive.

Some counselors find it easy to evaluate counseling outcome on the basis of the incidence of self-referrals; increase in test scores of clients; absenteeism of participants in a group etc. These are easier to measure than changes in self concept and attitudes. But is this really an objective description of what counselors out in the field are doing ? Would an elementary counselor be satisfied to be evaluated on such dimensions ? I doubt it. The fact is that the role of the elementary school counselor is complex. It involves many kinds and degrees of relationships.

Traditionally, outcome research has been predicated upon some theoretical framework. A counselor-educator would state a goal and then proceed to test whether he has been successful. Unfortunately, at the present time, we seem unable to agree upon a definition of counseling in the elementary school much more specific than:

The research writing, and practice to date is indicative of considerable agreement on a threefold function of the elementary school counselor, i.e, counseling with pupils, consulting with teachers and parents and coordinating the guidance activity. (Van Hoose, 1968)

What is needed is a multiphasic approach towards the analysis of actual counselor behavior on the job. Let us set aside for the moment the value judgment ridden discussion of the "ideal" counselor role. Let us begin to observe what the elementary counselor actually does.

Whether it is ideal or not, counselors in the elementary schools are performing a multitude of school related tasks. If we

can understand and describe these functions then we might be able to develop various methods of testing to what degree the counselor is meeting with success in relation to any specific task. At this moment we are not concerned if the particular task would be labeled appropriate or not by one counselor-educator or another. Let us see whether our counselors are doing successfully what they set out to do.

A research team could work together with counselors and develop an instrument that would measure relative success on any one of a hundred dimensions. From this survey of counselor tasks, counselor-educators could identify those which they would associate with their "ideal." Counselors, the meanwhile would be able to select the particular instrument they wish and evaluate any given task. Counselors could have at their disposal methods by which to analyze their success.

The parents, teachers and clients of counselors could also be interviewed and asked to respond to conceptual questions that have been extrapolated from the survey of tasks. They would also be asked to rate their counselor according to those criteria they felt important.

At this point we are ready to subject the data obtained above to statistical analysis. Hopefully, we will have created a core of common tasks that are agreed upon by both counselors, their employers, clients and professors which will best describe those behaviors that many successful counselor display.

With the development of such a survey tool, counselors are not bound to "ideal goals" which have been established in schools other than theirs and at times other than today. We claim that one of the qualities of good counselors is flexibility. It is essential that we make every effort to avoid imposing goals for counselors that are in reality not universal. The role of the elementary counselor is not a universal role; it is a personal and unique one derived from an amalgamation of school environment, administrative readiness and professional orientation.

I am not convinced that there is a "most effective" or "most desirable" role for the elementary counselor that should be promulgated across the land. The role of the counselor is probably more a function of the demands placed upon him by his particular setting than his philosophical disposition. Rogers and Maslow notwithstanding, the counselor in the elementary school does encounter situations ranging from sewing up pants to lending bus money. If the counselors are doing these tasks let us hope they are the best sewers and lenders around. For the time being, let us explore the various kinds of things counselors are doing and try to evaluate their relative success.

In the future we can attempt to identify those behaviors which we have found from experience constitute a constellation of ideal behaviors in a universal sense. Presently, elementary counseling may be too young to have adequate perspective.

Flow Chart of the Development and Use of the Counselor Task Survey

Theoretical-ideal

Counselor-educators develop a theoretical model for the "ideal" counselor in the elementary school.

Practical-real

A research team and selected elementary school counselors describe the actual tasks which counselors perform daily.

Counselor-educators, research designers and elementary school counselors create an instrument which will evaluate relative success of each of the tasks described above.

Counselor-educators will select from this survey those items which they associate with the ideal counselor

Teachers, administrators, clients and parents will select from this survey those items which they associate with the ideal counselor

Counselors will select from this survey those items which they associate with the ideal.

Data from the three sources above will be subjected to statistical analysis. A list of commonly agreed upon counselor tasks should emerge

Counselors may select those test items from the survey which will assist them in evaluating what they are actually doing at that time.

Based on this statistical data, counselor-educators should be able to provide prescriptive information unique to each school setting.

Based on the statistical analysis of the data, counselors may choose to increase the performance of some tasks while decreasing others with the knowledge that they are able to measure their relative success.

RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY — FORM OS-M-64

Below are listed a variety of ways that one person may feel or behave in relation to another person.

Please consider each statement with reference to your present relationship with your counselor.

Mark each statement in the left margin, according to how strongly you feel that it is true, or not true, in this relationship. Please mark every one. Write in +3, +2, +1 or -1, -2, -3, to stand for the following answers:

- +3: Yes, I strongly feel that it is true.
- +2: Yes, I feel it is true.
- +1: Yes, I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue.
- 1: No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.
- 2: No, I feel it is not true.
- 3: No, I strongly feel that it is not true.

1. He respects me as a person.
2. He wants to understand how I see things.
3. His interest in me depends on the things I say or do.
4. He is comfortable and at ease in our relationship.
5. He feels a true liking for me.
6. He may understand my words but he does not see the way I feel.
7. Whether I am feeling happy or unhappy with myself makes no real difference to the way he feels about me.
8. I feel that he puts on a role or front with me.
9. He is impatient with me.
10. He nearly always knows exactly what I mean.
11. Depending on my behavior, he has a better opinion of me sometimes than he has at other times.
12. I feel that he is real and genuine with me.
13. I feel appreciated by him.
14. He looks at what I do from his own point of view.
15. His feeling toward me doesn't depend on how I feel toward him.
16. It makes him uneasy when I ask or talk about certain things.
17. He is indifferent to me.
18. He usually senses or realizes what I am feeling.
19. He wants me to be a particular kind of person.
20. I nearly always feel that what he says expresses exactly what he is feeling and thinking as he says it.
21. He finds me rather dull and uninteresting.
22. His own attitudes toward some of the things I do or say prevent him from understanding me.
23. I can (or could) be openly critical or appreciative of him without really making him feel any differently about me.
24. He wants me to think that he likes me or understands me more than he really does.
25. He cares for me.
26. Sometimes he thinks that I feel a certain way, because that's the way he feels.
27. He likes certain things about me, and there are other things he does not like.
28. He does not avoid anything that is important for our relationship.
29. I feel that he disapproves of me.

30. He realizes what I mean even when I have difficulty in saying it.
31. His attitude toward me stays the same: he is not pleased with me sometimes and critical or disappointed at other times.
32. Sometimes he is not at all comfortable but we go on, outwardly ignoring it.
33. He just tolerates me.
34. He usually understands the whole of what I mean.
35. If I show that I am angry with him, he becomes hurt or angry with me too.
36. He expresses his true impressions and feelings with me.
37. He is friendly and warm with me.
38. He just takes no notice of some things that I think or feel.
39. How much he likes or dislikes me is not altered by anything that I tell him about myself.
40. At times I sense that he is not aware of what he is really feeling with me.
41. I feel that he really values me.
42. He appreciates exactly how the things I experience feel to me.
43. He approves of some things I do, and plainly disapproves of others.
44. He is willing to express whatever is actually in his mind with me, including any feelings about himself or about me.
45. He doesn't like me for myself.
46. At times he thinks that I feel a lot more strongly about a particular thing than I really do.
47. Whether I am in good spirits or feeling upset does not make him feel any more or less appreciative of me.
48. He is openly himself in our relationship.
49. I seem to irritate and bother him.
50. He does not realize how sensitive I am about some of the things we discuss.
51. Whether the ideas and feelings I express are "good" or "bad" seems to make no difference to his feeling toward me.
52. There are times when I feel that his outward response to me is quite different from the way he feels underneath.
53. At times he feels contempt for me.
54. He understands me.
55. Sometimes I am more worthwhile in his eyes than I am at other times.
56. I have not felt that he tries to hide anything from himself that he feels with me.
57. He is truly interested in me.
58. His response to me is usually so fixed and automatic that I don't really get through to him.
59. I don't think that anything I say or do really changes the way he feels toward me.
60. What he says to me often gives a wrong impression of his whole thought or feeling at the time.
61. He feels deep affection for me.
62. When I am hurt or upset he can recognize my feelings exactly, without becoming upset himself.
63. What other people think of me does (or would, if he knew) affect the way he feels toward me.
64. I believe that he has feelings he does not tell me about that are causing difficulty in our relationship.

TEACHER TALK	INDIRECT INFLUENCE	1.* ACCEPTS FEELING: accepts and clarifies the feeling tone of the students in a non-threatening manner. Feelings may be positive or negative. Predicting or recalling feelings are included. 2.* PRAISES OR ENCOURAGES: praises or encourages student action or behavior. Jokes that release tension, not at the expense of another individual, nodding head or saying "um hum" or "go on" are included. 3.* ACCEPTS OR USES IDEAS OF STUDENT: Clarifying, building or developing ideas suggested by students. As teacher brings more of his own ideas into play, shift category to five. 4.* ASK QUESTIONS: asking a question about content or procedure with the intent that a student answer.
	DIRECT INFLUENCE	5.* LECTURING: giving facts or opinions about content or procedure; expressing his own ideas, asking rhetorical questions. 6.* GIVING DIRECTIONS: directions, commands, or orders to which a student is expected to comply. 7.* CRITICIZING OR JUSTIFYING AUTHORITY: statements intended to change student behavior from nonacceptable to acceptable pattern; bawling someone out; stating why the teacher is doing what he is doing; extreme self reference.
STUDENT TALK		8.* STUDENT TALK-RESPONSE: talk initiated by students in response to teacher. Teacher initiates the contact or solicits student statement. 9.* STUDENT-TALK INITIATION: talk by students which they initiate. If "calling on" student only is to indicate who may talk next, observer may decide whether student wanted to talk. If he did, use nine.
		10.* SILENCE OR CONFUSION: pauses, short periods of silence and periods of confusion in which communicate cannot be understood by the observer.

* There is no scale implied by these numbers. Each number is a classificatory it designates a particular kind of communication event. To write these numbers down during observation is to enumerate, not to judge a position on a scale.

A Technique for Analyzing Counselor-Counselee Interaction [51]

Table 1: Categories for Interaction Analysis

Counselor Talk	Indirect Influence	1. • ACCEPTS FEELING: accepts and clarifies the feeling tone of the counselee in a nonthreatening manner. Feelings may be positive or negative. Predicting or recalling feelings are included. 2. • PRAISES OR ENCOURAGES: praises or encourages counselee action or behavior. Jokes that release tension, not at the expense of another individual, nodding head or saying "um hm?" or "go on" are included. 3. • ACCEPTS OR USES IDEAS OF COUNSELEE: clarifies, builds on, develops ideas or suggestions by a counselee. As counselor brings more of his own ideas into play, shift to category five. 4. • ASKS QUESTIONS: asking a question about content or procedure with the intent that a counselee answer.
	Direct Influence	5. • GIVES INFORMATION OR OPINION: gives information or opinions about content or procedure; expresses his own ideas; asks rhetorical question. 6. • GIVES DIRECTIONS: gives directions, commands, or orders to which a counselee is expected to comply. 7. • CRITICIZES OR JUSTIFIES AUTHORITY: makes statements intended to change counselee behavior from nonacceptable to acceptable pattern; bawls someone out; states why the counselor is doing what he is doing; extreme self-reference.
Counselee Talk		8. • COUNSELEE TALK-RESPONSE: talk by counselee in response to counselor. Counselor initiates the contact or solicits counselee statement. 9. • COUNSELEE TALK-INITIATION: talk by counselee which he initiates.
Other		10. • SILENCE: pauses, short periods of silence or breaks in the interaction.

* There is NO scale implied by these numbers. Each number is classificatory; it designates a particular kind of communication event. To write these numbers down during observation is to enumerate, not to judge a position on a scale.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amidon, E. J. and Flanders, N. A. The Role of the Teacher in the Classroom. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Paul S. Amidon and Associates, 1963.
- Amidon, E. J., "A Technique for Analyzing Counselor-Counselee Interaction," in Counseling and Guidance- A Summary View, James F. Adams, ed., New York, Collier-Macmillan, 1965.
- Arbuckle, Dugald, "Counseling Effectiveness and Related Issues," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 430-435.
- Aubrey, Roger F. "Misapplication of Therapy Models to School Counseling," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1969, 48, 273-278.
- Bergin, A. E. "An Empirical Analysis of Therapeutic Issues," in Arbuckle, D., "Counseling Effectiveness and Related Issues," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 430-435.
- Campbell, D. T. and Stanley, J. C., "Experimental and Quasi-experimental designs for research" in Kelley, J., Smits, S., Leventhal, R. and Rhodes, R. in "Critique of the Designs of Process and Outcome Research," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 337-341.
- Herr, Edwin and Hershberger, James, eds. Elementary School Guidance Work Conference. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Department of Public Instruction, 1967.
- Haase, Richard., and Miller, Dean, "Comparision of Factor Analytic Studies of the Counseling Evaluation Inventory," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 363-367.
- Kelley, J., Smits, S., Leventhal, R., and Rhodes, R., "Critique of the Designs of Process and Outcome Research," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 337-341.
- Knighten, Doss and Werner, Wayne E. "Counseling in the Elementary School: Does It Make a Difference?" in Caps Current Resource Series - Elementary School Counseling and Guidance, John E. Hechlik, ed. Ann Arbor, Counseling and Personnel Services Information Center (ERIC), 1968.
- Kranzler, Gerald. "Elementary School Counseling: An Evaluation," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1968, 2, 286-294.
- Lee, Walter S. "The Evaluation of School Guidance Programs," The School Counselor, 1969, 17, 84-88.
- Linden, James, Stone, Shelley, and Shertzer, Bruce. "Development and Evaluation of an Inventory for Rating Counselors," in Research in Counseling, Lawrence Litwack, Russel Getson and Glenn Saltzman, eds., Itasca, Ill. Peacock, 1968.
- Matthes, William A., Kranzler, Gerald D., and Mayer, Roy G. "The Relationship Between the Client's Perceptions of Counselor Behavior and Change in the Client's Behavior." Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1968, 2, 179-186.

O'Hern, S., and Arbuckle, Dugald S. "Sensitivity: A Measurable Concept?" in Research in Counseling, Lawrence Litwack, Russel Getson and Glenn Saltzman, eds., Itasca, Ill. Peacock, 1968.

Schmiedling, Orville A. "An Investigation of ... Efficacy of Counseling and Guidance Procedures with Failing Junior High School Students," in Research in Counseling, Lawrence Litwack, Russel Getson and Glenn Saltzman, Eds., Itasca, Ill. Peacock, 1968.

Schumacher, Ray M. "Rating of Competence of Counselors and Psychotherapists," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 440-443.

Schwartz, Richard K. and Ohlsen, Merle M. "A Content Analysis Technique for Evaluating Outcomes in Counseling," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1968, 47, 346-352.

Siegel, Betty. "Evaluating a Guidance Counselor," The School Counselor, 1969, 16, 309-311.

Tyler, Leona. The Work of the Counselor. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961.

Van Hoose, William. Counseling in the Elementary School. Itasca, Ill.: Peacock, 1968.

Section II

Valuing Counseling

(Methods of Developing Positive
Regard Towards Counseling for Students
At the Middle School Level)

INTRODUCTION

Counseling is a complex relationship among teachers, students administrators, clients and counselors. Producing approach behavior towards counseling by students is only one small part of the entire counseling process. Although this is of course a prerequisite for effective counseling, it is by no means synonymous with the entire concept of counseling. Furthermore, the ultimate goal of effective counseling must be facilitating independence and responsibility on the part of the client.

The process at first involves developing approach behavior and rapport between the client and the counselor. This should not be interpreted as fostering a dependent relationship. Once the specific goals of counseling have been met, termination of the relationship is in order. Ideally the client at some point concludes that he no longer needs the counselor and can make it on his own.

Whereas in the beginning of the relationship the counselor was concerned with developing approach behavior towards the counseling process, once the client seems capable of interacting without the assistance of the counselor, the counselor stresses separation. Hopefully the client realizes that he may return at any time. One need not be actively engaged in an ongoing counseling relationship to value counseling.

Although in many ways the counseling process is similar to other learning experiences it is very different from the typical classroom setting. The English teacher, for example, strives to have her students demonstrate approach behavior towards English for an indefinite period.

If a student who once showed great interest in English soon lost his zeal, the teacher may question the overall success of her methods. On the other hand, the most successful counseling case is the one where the client has both resolved his conflict and terminated counseling contact.

In the broadest sense, one may say that if a client truly values counseling then in the future he will seek such help again if needed. This is true. But in an immediate sense, in terms of evaluating a counseling program within the three or four years a student stays at the particular school, it becomes necessary to be satisfied with certain unanswerable questions. For example; "Does the student value counseling five years after graduation?"

It is possible to construct a counseling program in behavioral terms that can be swiftly and accurately evaluated. But frankly, there seems to be more to the complex issues of counseling today than can be accommodated into such a framework. At the present time we lack the sophistication to measure rapport which too many counselor-educators is a vital component of the successful relationship. Insight is another issue which seems to defy evaluation but is nevertheless a part of counseling theory.

The dilemma arises, not in terms of objectives or methods, but in our inability to develop sensitive and sophisticated instruments appropriate to the complexities of the counseling process. Merely breaking it down into small component parts and testing each part individually doesn't seem to resolve the issue. Sometimes the whole is greater than the sum of its parts.

Learning theorists have developed a behavioral model for counseling. Behavioral counseling does not concern itself with much more than what can be clearly defined in behavioral terms and equally measured. There is no doubt that there are many school related problems that can be effectively resolved through the application of various behavior modification techniques. But the school counselor is limited in terms of the variety of reinforcers he may employ. Furthermore, it appears as though the state of the art is such that we don't know what it would take to reinforce some clients.

The greatest limitation to a strict application of the behavioral model to counseling is that it defines counseling too narrowly. Rather than admitting that we lack the skill to evaluate the complexities of the entire counseling relationship, behavioral counseling stresses the theory that if it can't be defined behaviorally and evaluated effectively then it is of questionable value.

Behavioral counseling has had a positive impact on the process of counseling despite this limitation. It has forced counselors to be more specific in many of their objectives and has urged them to consider the need for evaluating whether they have or have not met these objectives. Counselors have been too prone to throw up their hands in frustration and claim that they know what they are doing but can't prove it.

Counselor-educators seem unable to agree on which variables constitute the ideal counseling relationship and how they effect counseling outcome. Few educators agree on how outcome should be evaluated. It is my contention, that until counselor-educators can agree on what constitutes

effect of the counseling outcome, and research designers are capable of measuring what the counselor-educators previously agreed upon we are relegated to a rather hit and miss approach towards counseling. But let us at least be as effective as we possibly can be when we "hit."

There is general agreement that a desirable goal of school counseling is that the students both take advantage of the counseling service and value it. It is possible, therefore, to describe various methods which will facilitate and produce approach behavior. There are several methods, some of which are admittedly superficial, that will evaluate the frequency of such approaches. There are even fewer techniques that can efficiently evaluate qualitative responses.

The major objective of this paper is the describing of methods by which valuing of counseling by students in a middle school can be produced and evaluated in behavioral terms.

OBJECTIVES

I. Awareness:

- A. Children will know who the counselor is.
- B. Children will know where the counselor's office is located.
- C. Children will know what a counselor does. (See II Responding for list)
- D. Children will know how to go about arranging for appointments. (This will be discussed in detail in Methods and Media)
- E. Children will know what the relationship is between the counselor and the principal, faculty and community.

- F. Children will have an idea what transpires during a typical counseling session (See Methods).

II. Responding

- A. Students will individually initiate contacts with their counselor in relation to the following problems, among others:
1. need for information
 2. need for changes in the rosters
 3. academic difficulty
 4. transitory social problems
 5. serious peer group relationship problems
 6. serious personal and home related problems
- B. Groups of students will initiate contacts with their counselor in relation to those items, among others listed above.
- C. When a student is sent to the counselor by a teacher he will come willingly and cooperate once there, as follows:
1. come
 2. come on time
 3. once in office will sit down willingly
 4. will talk about things in general
 5. will discuss basic problem which precipitated his coming
 6. will explore the various alternatives available
 7. will attempt to select the best alternative for himself
 8. will map out a path of action consistent with his chosen alternative
 9. will demonstrate an attempt at following through
 10. will report back to the counselor about his relative success and/or his desire for additional counseling sessions

- D. Students will share with each other and their parents their experiences with the counselor.
- E. Students will encourage their parents to participate in the counseling process with them by having them contact the counselor.
- F. Children will associate unconditional acceptance, concern and positive regard with seeing the counselor.

III. Valuing

Students in the Ward Middle School will value contacts with the counselor at their school in particular and contacts with counselors in general.*

ENTERING BEHAVIOR

I. The Setting:

- A. The students participating in our project attend the Ward Middle School which services children in grades five through eight.
- B. This is the first year that the Ward Middle School has ever had a counselor.
- C. There are 500 students in the school.
- D. None of the feeding elementary schools had counselors, either.
- E. The School is in a white suburban area with a blue and white collar population. There are more white collar workers than blue.
- F. The ability of the student population is normally distributed except that those students who qualify for special education are educated elsewhere.
- G. This is the first experience most students have had with a counselor.

*The valuing of counseling contacts by students is only a facet of the counselor's job in a school setting where he must work with parents, teachers, administrators and representatives of the community. This objective deals only with student behavior.

II. The Students' Behaviors and Feelings: (hypothesized)

- A. Since this is their first experience with counseling, the students are suspicious, scared, confused, apprehensive and inquisitive about counseling.
- B. The counselor has his own private office, unfortunately, next to the administrative suite of offices. Most students associate the counselor with the administration. (See Conditions)
- C. Students are unaware of what a counselor does, why and how he does it.
- D. Students don't know how to react or respond to the counselor and tend to play safe and treat him like he was another principal at first.
- E. Students have had little if any experience in the past in discussing in an accepting and non-threatening environment their interpersonal relationships, personal concerns and academic interests.
- F. Students, who in the past have had difficulty getting along in school tend to be more suspicious of the counselor than their counterparts who have been successful in school.

III. The Students, Behaviors and Feelings: (Tested)

- A. Students will be administered the Counseling Inventory (see Appendix) both at the beginning and the end of the year.
- B. Careful records of the number of self-referrals will be kept so as to compare any increase or decrease over the school year.
- C. The nature of the self-referrals will also be evaluated as follows:
 - 1. the need for information
 - 2. need for changes in rosters
 - 3. academic difficulty
 - 4. transitory social problems
 - 5. serious peer group relationship problems
 - 6. serious personal and home related problems

- D. Frequency of parent-initiated contact with the counselor as a function of client encouragement.

METHODS

- I. Introduction of Counseling Service - initial contact with large group setting (about 35 in a class).
 - A. The counselor will begin by writing his full name on the black-board and introducing himself, including the use of his title "Guidance Counselor."
 - B. Students will be asked to arrange their chairs in a circle.
 - C. Name cards, to be placed on the desks, will be distributed so as to facilitate the counselor's matching names and faces.
 - D. The students will be told what will happen during this lesson:
 1. we will play a game about feelings
 2. the counselor will describe what a counselor does
 - E. The Game:
 1. The teacher will participate along with the students and the counselor.
 2. The game will take about 30 minutes.
 3. Rules and description:
 - a. "This is a circle game which deals with feelings.
 - b. Everyone is welcome to participate but if you wish to watch that is OK - just say "I pass."
 - c. The counselor will begin with a "kernel" sentence, like "My favorite flavor of ice-cream is . . ." and then will complete it as follows: "My favorite flavor of ice-cream is chocolate."
 - d. "John, who is sitting to the counselor's right will repeat what the counselor just said as follows: Mr. Weinrach says that his favorite flavor of ice-cream is chocolate" and then John will use the kernel sentence "My favorite flavor of ice-cream is" and add his ending "strawberry."

- e. "Mary who is sitting next to John will repeat just what John said and then add her ending."
 - f. "This is not a memory game. All you have to do is repeat what your neighbor said and then complete the kernel sentence yourself."
 - g. "If you forget what your neighbor said or didn't understand him, feel free to ask him to repeat it."
 - h. "Remember, this is not a memory game, you just repeat what the one neighbor sitting next to you just said."
 - i. "Now let's go through one round quickly with the kernel sentence 'My favorite flavor of ice-cream is. . .'"
4. Examples of kernel sentences are:
- a. I like school most when . . .
 - b. I get embarrassed when . . .
 - c. My mother is in a good mood when . . .
 - d. I can always tell when my dad is angry when . . .
 - e. Teachers are. . .
 - f. What really gets me angry is . . .
 - g. My brother (or sister) and I fight because . . .
 - h. When I get yelled at by a teacher in class for making a mistake and the kids laugh, I feel . . .
 - i. I get scared when . . .
5. Procedures:
- a. After several rounds the counselor may stop the game and ask the group to discuss their reactions to what the others said.
 - b. Students will be encouraged to see that many people respond to the same situation in the same way.
 - c. The counselor will reinforce frank and honest expression of feelings.

- d. The counselor will accept those who wish to remain silent.
 - e. The teacher and counselor will participate as integral members of the group.
 - f. The counselor will ask the students to summarize what just transpired.
 - g. The counselor will capitalize on student comments and summarize and conclude the game or have several more rounds depending on time.
- F. The counselor will describe to students that counseling is all about feelings and how people get along with each other. The counselor will describe the method by which appointments may be made - either through their teacher, directly through the counselor or by leaving a note on the counselor's door. (See Media and Appendix)

The counselor will briefly outline under what circumstances a student would see the counselor:

- 1. need for information
- 2. need for changes in rosters
- 3. academic difficulty
- 4. transitory social problems
- 5. serious peer group relationship problems
- 6. serious personal and home related problems

II. Continuation of Counseling Service (with a class of 35 students)

- A. The counselor will tell the boys and girls that today they are going to:
 - 1. Play another game - a word game - like hangman, and
 - 2. describe some of the problems that they think a counselor would want to know about.
- B. The Game - Rules and Description
 - 1. The counselor will write on the blackboard - - - - -

2. The counselor will describe the symptoms of a disease and the children will begin to guess what the name of the disease is.
3. The symptoms are:
 - a. Everybody gets it around the ages 11 - 14.
 - b. Girls usually get it first.
 - c. It lasts for several years.
 - d. There is no cure and you don't see the doctor.
 - e. Although you may feel sweaty at times, there is no fever.
 - f. There are no pains except sometimes in the heart.
 - g. Crying and yelling are often associated with this disease.
 - h. Both your teacher and your counselor had this disease.
 - i. Everybody recovers sooner or later.
4. The children begin to guess and if they need help the counselor writes G - - - - - U -
5. The kids guess the disease is called:
"G R O W I N G U P"
6. Children are asked for examples of problems associated with growing up - responses are usually like the following:
 - a. Not getting along with other kids; fighting.
 - b. Not getting along with parents.
 - c. Flunking math.
 - d. Having crushes.
 - e. Not knowing what to do next.
 - f. Not knowing what one wants to be in later years.
 - g. Being afraid of teachers.
 - h. Hating school.

- i. Wanting to run away from home.
- j. Hating the science teacher.
- C. The list will be written on the board and the counselor will discuss with the children:
 - 1. How counseling can help.
 - 2. What counseling can and cannot do.
 - 3. What the client's responsibility is in terms of counseling.
- D. The children will be told that the next time the counselor comes in they will role play a counseling session so they have an idea of what actually goes on.

III. Continuation of Counseling Service -(with a class of 35)

- A. This session with each class constitutes a role playing situation between the counselor and one or two students from the class.
 - 1. The students decide from the list that they prepared earlier which problem they want to see role played.
 - 2. The students are asked to volunteer to participate. If no one does, the teacher will play the role of the student the first time.
 - 3. Usually for the 2nd role playing session there are plenty of volunteers.
 - 4. Role Playing (provides children with a peer model who responds positively to counseling).
 - a. The counselor, as though he was in his office, does the following:
 - (1) introduces himself
 - (2) greets the student
 - (3) tries to make the student feel at ease
 - (4) asks what he can do for the student
 - b. The client expresses the problem - I can't get along with my mom.

- c. The counselor and role-playing client discuss what the problem is and try to isolate those variables which are causing the most difficulty.
- d. The counselor will encourage the client to express his feelings and once expressed will reinforce him for his openness.
- e. The counselor will help the client see what choices or alternatives he has in regard to the particular problem.
- f. The counselor encourages the student to make various decisions which will effect his course of action with his next encounter with his mom.
- g. The counselor will plan with the student for additional interview dates.
- h. A group counseling session - role playing with volunteers will follow if deemed appropriate.

5. Discussion

- a. The class will be encouraged to respond to the role playing.
- b. Asked how they felt about what the client did; the counselor did.
- c. Asked about questions concerning what does on - what to expect.
- d. Asked about procedures on how to see the counselor - where office is and that they are always welcome (open door policy).

IV. The counselor and small group counseling

A. Problem Centered - Academic

- 1. The counselor will send for all students in groups of 5 or 6, divided according to grade level and sex if they received any "unsats" during the report period.
- 2. The counselor will send for any children, according to sex and grade level if they received any "Failures" on their grade card during any report period.

3. The groups will sit with the counselor and the students will be encouraged to discuss their feelings about failure, what if anything they intend doing about it and what alternatives are open to them.
4. The counselor will verbally reinforce those responses that indicate an intent to change behavior in the direction desired.
5. Negative responses will not be rejected but rather thrown back at the group to discuss and handle.
6. Students will be encouraged to meet with the counselor, individually if they so choose.
7. Students with multiple failures and high scores on achievement tests (i.e., under-achievers) will be asked if they wish to participate in an on-going weekly group counseling experience.
8. The responsibility of talking during these group meetings, whether they be a "one-shot deal" or an on-going series of conferences will lie with all of the participants and not just the counselor. Clients may terminate any conference at their will - without fear of punishment.

B. Problem centered - social

1. Students with social problems, usually identified by teachers will be asked to meet with the counselor and discuss the nature of the problems and what alternatives they see in resolving the conflict.
2. These students will be given the same options as noted above.
3. Students with interpersonal problems are usually more receptive to discussion than those with academic problems and therefore will be given the opportunity to discuss their problems in the counselor's office without the counselor being present at all times.
4. The results of said discussion will be shared with the counselor if the participants so choose.

C. Non-problem centered counseling - academic

1. All students who make the honor roll will be interviewed in groups so as to communicate the counselor's pleasure with their success.

2. Questions about future educational and occupational plans will be encouraged.
3. Where it was not publicized that students who received unsats were being seen in groups by the counselor, those with academic honors will be invited via letters and public address announcements so that the entire school will know that counselors see children for a variety of reasons.

D. Non-Problem Centered Counseling - general

1. Students who achieve success in sports, orchestra, dramatics and other school related activities will be interviewed by the counselor and encouraged to discuss what they did which brought them such success.
2. The counselor will discuss the possible implications of their success on future occupational or educational plans.
3. The counselor will interpret standardized test scores for students and parents.

V. Individual Counseling* - The essence of any counseling program is individual counseling.

A. Individual Counseling-Problem centered

1. Students will be made to feel welcomed, accepted and cared for by means of assurance, encouragement and attentiveness.
2. Client growth will be recognized, discussed and reinforced.
3. The client will be encouraged to evaluate the effects of counseling on his behavior. (Has counseling been helpful?)
4. Clients will be encouraged to set goals for themselves and evaluate their success in achieving these goals.

*The methods discussed below are only selected examples of the counseling process. They in no way constitute a list of a complete repertoire of counseling techniques and should not be construed as such.

- a. John has been absent 40% of the time without good cause.
 - b. John is interested in improving his attendance record.
 - c. John decides that for the present time, 80% attendance would be good.
 - d. After several weeks John is asked to evaluate his success in relation to his goals and attendance record.
5. Clients will be encouraged to discuss with their parents the fact that they are seeing the counselor.
- a. Clients will be informed that at times, it is appropriate for parents to participate in the counseling process.
6. The counselor will use, where professionally appropriate, various behavior modification techniques.
- a. Some sample items used as reinforcers might be:
 - (1) We Try Harder Pins
 - (2) candy
 - (3) balloons
 - (4) verbal praise
7. Counselors will urge clients to write contracts whereby the clients agree to do certain things with specified rewards. Parents often participate in the area of rewarding if the client agrees.
8. Where necessary a counselor will assist a client to discuss a problem with a teacher in the counselor's office with the counselor present and taking as passive a role as appropriate. This provides support for the client.
9. The greatest of reinforcers in counseling is success. When the client feels that he has resolved his conflict and has taken the appropriate action as he views it, then the experience is self-reinforcing.
- B. Individual Counseling - non problem centered
- 1. Students frequently want information about school activities, interpretation of standardized test scores, school policy, news about recreational and employment opportunities etc. This will be provided as pleasantly and efficiently as possible.

2. The counselor will facilitate the client obtaining the necessary information if the counselor doesn't himself have it.

VI. Exposure:

- A. Before a school population can take advantage of the services of a counselor they must first feel warmly towards him as a person.
- B. It will be necessary for the counselor, whose role is one of acceptance and positive regard to overlook much of what goes on in the halls when students are making noise and running.
- C. It must be obvious to the students that when they see the counselor they don't have to worry about getting yelled at for misbehaving.
- D. Some methods by which this can be best accomplished are as follows:
 1. Walking the halls between classes.
 2. Eating lunch with students or at least sitting with them at their lunch tables from time to time.
 3. Float in and out of the nurses office and show interest in how they are feeling.
 4. Be quick to assist a pupil in need - lend money, pencils, paper and a telephone book when appropriate.
 5. Talk with teachers between classes so that the students see that the teachers respond favorably towards the counselor.
 6. Stand outside before and after school talking with various groups.
 7. Smile acceptingly when children are sitting on "the office bench."
 8. Seek out conversations with students - wherever their "turf" is.
 9. Write notes to students who have done well - either in-lieu or in conjunction with an interview.
 10. Write letters to parents when a counseling case who has had serious adjustment problems seems to show definite signs of improvement.

11. Encourage teachers to invite the counselor in as a resource person in mental health, occupational information, counseling as a profession.
12. Work with the editor of the student newspaper and feature articles that relate to counseling - "all Honor Roll Students receive letter of Congratulations."

VII. The Media: (Examples appear in the Appendix)

- A. Schools don't often capitalize on the use of media to influence opinion.
- B. The following methods may help get the message across:
 1. Distribute posters that encourage students to complete their education.
 2. Post signs that indicate when and how a student may make an appointment to see his counselor.
 3. Obtain occupational information at the students' reading levels and distribute it freely.
 4. Where students are being seen because of some outstanding accomplishment, rather than sending for them individually, have them paged over the Public Address system.
 5. Give appointment slips to children which have some implied status attached to them rather than a run-of-the-mill school form.
 6. Display children's art work in the office.
 7. Display children's academic work as long as it shows improvement even if the mark is a C (where the child had F's before.)
 8. Be willing to show children the counseling record if they seem interested. (Confidential information about adoption etc. should be filed separately anyhow).

VIII. Conditions:

- A. Counselor's offices should not look like offices.
- B. It is possible without spending very much money, if any at all, to convert a typical office into a place where it is conducive to talk and relax.

- C. The following are some suggestions as to how this can be done:
1. Push the desk against the wall. Never talk across a desk to a client. If possible, get rid of the desk and use a round table.
 2. Never have academic, official looking papers cluttering the desk. They intimidate students.
 3. Display children's art work all over the wall so as to cover the usual school drab.
 4. Scrounge from the teachers' lounge a comfortable chair for the client to sit in. If this is impossible, spend a few dollars and purchase a foam rubber cushion for the client.
 5. Where the student population is fifth grade and under have junior size chairs available so that the client's feet will comfortably touch the floor. The counselor should sit in one too.
 6. Have toys, wood shop projects, games, puzzles, goldfish (obtained from the science budget) and paper weights that can be used to "break the ice" with.
 7. Have a big box of kleenex next to the client's chair.
 8. Most people like candy; keep some around.
 9. Refuse telephone calls and interruptions from faculty members when talking with a client.
 10. Keep a needle, thread and collection of safety pins available at all times.
 11. Smile.

EVALUATION

- I. This is unquestionably the most serious and difficult aspect of the counseling process. It is also the one most neglected. Research in the field has been sparse. Methods for effective evaluation have been limited in scope. Instruments which have been developed are generally rather crude. Some instruments which have been successfully used at the college and high school level need to be adapted to the reading and conceptual level of younger children. An example of this is the "Relationship Inventory." (See Appendix).

II. Methods of evaluation

- A. All students shall be pre and post tested using the "Counseling Inventory." (See Appendix) (Whether they were clients or not).
- B. The number of self-referrals will be compared between the beginning and end of the school year.
- C. The quality of the self-referrals will be evaluated as follows:
 - 1. Need for information.
 - 2. Need for changes in rosters.
 - 3. Academic difficulty.
 - 4. Transitory social problems.
 - 5. Serious peer group relationship problems.
 - 6. Serious personal and home related problems.
- D. Frequency of parent initiated contact with the counselor as a function of client encouragement.
- E. Number of invitations to participate in classroom activities as resource person.
- F. Client promptness for interviews.
- G. Rate of client cancellation of appointments.
- H. Rate of client forgetting to come to interviews and not cancelling.
- I. Degree of client satisfaction with the counseling relationship as measured by the "Relationship Inventory."
- J. Re-administration of the "Counseling Inventory" in five years to see whether the students continued to respond in the same way they did the first two times the inventory was administered.
- K. Re-administration of the "Relationship Inventory" five years hence to those students who were clients to see whether their responses remained consistent.

An Annotated Bibliography

The introduction to this paper was based on information found in the following books and journals:

- Amidon, E. J., "A Technique for Analyzing Counselor-Counselees Interaction," in Counseling and Guidance - A Summary View, James F. Adams, ed., New York, Collier-MacMillan, 1965.
- Arbuckle, Dugald, "Counseling Effectiveness and Related Issues," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 430-435.
- Haase, Richard, and Miller, Dean, "Comparison of Factors Analytic Studies of the Counseling Evaluation Inventory," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 363 - 367.
- Kelley, J., Smits, S., Leventhal, R., and Rhodes, R., "Critique of the Designs of Process and Outcome Research," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 337-341.
- Linden, James, Stone, Shelley., and Shertzer, Bruce, "Development and Evaluation of an Inventory for Rating Counselors," in Research in Counseling, Lawrence Litwack, Russel Getson and Glen Saltzman editors., Itasca, Ill. Peacock, 1968.
- O'Hern, S., and Arbuckle, Dugald S., "Sensitivity: A Measurable Concept?", in Research in Counseling, Lawrence Litwack, Russel Getson and Glenn Saltzman, editors, Itasca, Ill. Peacock, 1968.
- Shertzer, Bruce, and Stone, Shelley C., Fundamentals of Counseling. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.
- Tyler, Leona, The Work of the Counselor. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961.

The following materials were consulted in the formulation of the remainder of the paper:

- Blair, Glenn Myers, and Jones, R. Stewart. Psychology of Adolescence for Teachers. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1964.
- Ferguson, Lucy Rau. Personality Development. Belmont, California: Brooks Cole Publishing Company, 1970.

- Hill, Winfred F. Learning: A Survey of Psychological Interpretations. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1963.
- Holt, John. How Children Fail. New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1964.
- Mager, Robert F. Developing Attitude Toward Learning. Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers, 1968.
- Mager, Robert F. Preparing Instructional Objectives. Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers, 1962.
- Zimbardo, Philip, and Ebbesen, Ebbe. Influencing Attitudes and Changing Behavior. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.

COUNSELING INVENTORY

Stephen Weinrach, 1970

1. Where is the counselor's office?
2. What is it like inside?
3. What is the counselor's name?
4. What happens when a student sees the counselor?
5. When I see the counselor in the hall, I feel ---.
6. What kinds of information does the counselor give out?
7. If you did something wrong, what would the counselor do about it?
8. Is the counselor bossy?
9. Does the counselor give lectures?
10. Does the counselor like me?
11. Does the counselor care about how I am getting along?
12. If I had a serious school problem, who would I tell first? second?
13. Kids who see the counselor are ---.
14. If I had a serious personal problem, I would tell ---.
15. What is the difference between the counselor and the principal?
16. The worst thing about our counselor is?
17. The best thing about our counselor is?
18. If my mother came and spoke with my counselor, I would ---.
19. To get an appointment to see the counselor, you ---.
20. If the counselor sent for me, I would -----.
21. If my teacher suggested that I see the counselor, I would ---.
22. When I go by the counselor's office and see a friend of mine inside, I think --.

23. Why does the counselor send for some children?
24. Where in the building have you seen the counselor besides his office?
25. If I had a younger brother in this school and he asked me about the counselor, I would say that ---.

To: The Boys and Girls

From: Mr. S. Weinrach, Guidance Counselor

Re: Making an appointment with your counselor

Mr. Weinrach is usually in school every Tuesday and Thursday. He also is here every other Friday. If you would like to see him and he is not in his office, please do one of the following:

1. Go across to the main office and ask the secretary to leave a message with your name on it.
2. Put a note in Mr. Weinrach's mail box which is in the main office.
3. Ask one of your teachers to leave a note for Mr. Weinrach

Generally, I am able to see those boys and girls who leave their name within a day or two. Thank you.

Stephen G. Weinrach

Guidance Counselor

BOARD OF EDUCATION

EVERETT M. JACOBSON
 ROBERT M. BAUER
 JAMES A. HIRSH
 JAMES A. HIRSH
 JAMES A. HIRSH

EDWARD W. BENTLEY, CLERK

Northwood Local Schools

Northwood, Ohio

600 Lamoyne Road

Toledo, Ohio

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

600 LAMOYNE ROAD
 TOLEDO, OHIO 43616
 SUPT. EDWARD C. JONES

51

COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT

ELMER HARRIS
 DOWLING GREEN, OHIO

NORTHWOOD HIGH SCHOOL

7501 DARTMOUTH ROAD
 TOLEDO, OHIO 43616
 PRINCIPAL, JERRY GARDNER

NORTHWOOD JR. HIGH

3755 WOODVILLE ROAD
 TOLEDO, OHIO 43616
 PRINCIPAL, IRVING SEAL

LARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

391 ANDRUS ROAD
 TOLEDO, OHIO 43602
 PRINCIPAL, DON KETTINGER

OLNEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

518 LAMOYNE ROAD
 TOLEDO, OHIO 43606
 PRINCIPAL, KENNETH MELARY

November 20, 1970

Dear Northwood Scholar,

Congratulations!

As your guidance counselor, I want to let you know how proud I am of your success so far this year. Now that you have gotten off to a running start, I hope you can continue doing so well in your studies. It is not easy to get such good marks. The boys and girls who succeed in school are usually the ones who are prepared to spend the necessary time at home doing their school work. Often it means a little less television, too! You must have worked hard. Keep it up. Success is its own reward.

Sincerely,

Stephen G. Weinrach
 Guidance Counselor

SGW/uj

MARC, TOM,
GREG, Rich⁵².
Mr. Weinrach
Mrs. Sobb

CONTRACT

DATE: Dec. 4, 1970

PLACE: Northwood Middle School

Sec. I. IF Marc Allen receives 2 out of 3 yes votes from the judges. to the following question he will win 3 WTH PINS.

Q: HAS MARC IMPROVED his CLASSROOM behavior IN Mrs. Sobb's room?

Sec. II IF The judges agree with Mrs. Sobb they shall each get 1 (one) WTH pin.

Sec. III IF All 3 judges agree with Mrs. Sobb & the answer is "yes" Everyone gets 3 WTH Pins.

Sec. IV This will be done Fridays at 9 AM or Thurs. at 2³⁰
Squawish

Section III

Model Outcome Research Project

(Student Perceptions of Counseling at
the Northwood Middle School
Between October and December 1970)

I. INTRODUCTION

Counseling is a complex relationship among teachers, students administrators, clients and counselors. Producing approach behavior towards counseling by students is only one small part of the entire counseling process. Although this is of course a prerequisite for effective counseling, it is by no means synonymous with the entire concept of counseling. Furthermore, the ultimate goal of effective counseling must be facilitating independence and responsibility on the part of the client.

The process at first involves developing approach behavior and rapport between the client and the counselor. This should not be interpreted as fostering a dependent relationship. Once the specific goals of counseling have been met, termination of the relationship is in order. Ideally the client at some point concludes that he no longer needs the counselor and can make it on his own.

Whereas in the beginning of the relationship the counselor was concerned with developing approach behavior towards the counseling process, once the client seems capable of interacting without the assistance of the counselor, the counselor stresses separation. Hopefully the client realizes that he may return at any time. One need not be actively engaged in an ongoing counseling relationship to value counseling.

Although in many ways the counseling process is similar to other learning experiences it is very different from the typical classroom setting. The English teacher, for example, strives to have her students demonstrate approach behavior towards English for an indefinite period. If a student who once showed great interest in English soon lost his zeal, the teacher may question the overall success of her methods. On the other hand, the most successful counseling case is the one where the client has both resolved his conflict and terminated counseling contact.

In the broadest sense, one may say that if a client truly values counseling then in the future he will seek such help again if needed. This is true. But in an immediate sense, in terms of evaluating a counseling program within the three or four years a student stays at the particular school, it becomes necessary to be satisfied with certain unanswerable questions. For example; "Does the student value counseling five years after graduation?"

It is possible to construct a counseling program in behavioral terms that can be swiftly and accurately evaluated. But frankly, there seems to be more to the complex issues of counseling today than can be accommodated into such a framework. At the present time we lack the sophistication to measure rapport which too many counselor-educators is a vital component of the successful relationship. Insight is another issue which seems to defy evaluation but is nevertheless a part of counseling theory.

The dilemma arises, not in terms of objectives or methods, but in our inability to develop sensitive and sophisticated instruments appropriate to

the complexities of the counseling process. Merely breaking it down into small component parts and testing each part individually doesn't seem to resolve the issue. Sometimes the whole is greater than the sum of its parts.

Learning theorists have developed a behavioral model for counseling. Behavioral counseling does not concern itself with much more than what can be clearly defined in behavioral terms and equally measured. There is no doubt that there are many school related problems that can be affectively resolved through the application of various behavior modification techniques. But the school counselor is limited in terms of the variety of reinforcers he may employ. Furthermore, it appears as though the state of the art is such that we don't know what it would take to reinforce some clients.

The greatest limitation to a strict application of the behavioral model to counseling is that it defines counseling too narrowly. Rather than admitting that we lack the skill to evaluate the complexities of the entire counseling relationship, behavioral counseling stresses the theory that if it can't be defined behaviorally and evaluated effectively then it is of questionable value.

Behavioral counseling has had a positive impact on the process of counseling despite this limitation. It has forced counselors to be more specific in many of their objectives and has urged them to consider the need for evaluating whether they have or have not met these objectives. Counselors have been too prone to throw up their hands in frustration and claim that they know what they are doing but can't prove it.

Counselor-educators seem unable to agree on which variables constitute the ideal counseling relationship and how they effect counseling outcome. Few educators agree on how outcome should be evaluated. It is my contention, that until counselor-educators can agree on what constitutes effective counseling outcome, and research designers are capable of measuring what the counselor-educators previously agreed upon we are relegated to a rather hit and miss approach towards counseling. But let us at least be as effective as we possibly can be when we "hit."

There is general agreement that a desirable goal of school counseling is that the students both take advantage of the counseling service and value it. It is possible, therefore, to describe various methods which will facilitate and produce approach behavior. There are several methods, some of which are admittedly superficial, that will evaluate the frequency of such approaches. There are even fewer techniques that can efficiently evaluate qualitative responses.

The major objective of this paper is the describing of methods by which valuing of counseling by students in a middle school can be assessed and the analysis of such data obtained at the Northwood Middle School between October and December, 1970.

II. GENERAL OBJECTIVES

A. Awareness

1. Children will know who the counselor is.
2. Children will know where the counselor's office is located.
3. Children will know what a counselor does. (See B Responding for list).
4. Children will know how to go about arranging for appointments.
5. Children will know what the relationship is between the counselor and the principal, faculty and community.
6. Children will have an idea what transpires during a typical counseling session.

B. Responding

1. Students will individually initiate contacts with their counselor in relation to the following problems, among others:
 - a. need for information
 - b. need for changes in the rosters
 - c. academic difficulty
 - d. transitory social problems
 - e. serious peer group relationship problems
 - f. serious personal and home-related problems
2. Groups of students will initiate contacts with their counselors in relation to those items, among others listed above.
3. When a student is sent to the counselor by a teacher he will come willingly and cooperate once there, as follows:
 - a. come
 - b. come on time
 - c. once in office will sit down willingly
 - d. will talk about things in general
 - e. will discuss basic problem which precipitated his coming
 - f. will explore the various alternatives available.

- g. will attempt to select the best alternative for himself
- h. will map out a path of action consistent with his chosen alternative
- i. will demonstrate an attempt at following through
- j. will report back to the counselor about his relative success and/or his desire for additional counseling sessions
- 4. Students will share with each other and their parents their experiences with the counselor.
- 5. Students will encourage their parents to participate in the counseling process with them by having them contact the counselor.
- 6. Children will associate unconditional acceptance, concern and positive regard with seeing the counselor.

C. Valuing

Students in the Northwood Middle School will value contacts with the counselor at their school in particular and contacts with counselors in general.*

III. RESEARCH DESIGN

A. Purpose

The purpose of this project was to determine to what extent the students at the Northwood Middle School displayed approach behavior towards their counselor.

B. Population

The entire student body at the Northwood Middle School were administered the Student Attitude Questionnaire on the same day in December of 1970. The total number of respondents was 219, the school population was 235.

*The valuing of counseling contacts by students is only a facet of the counselor's job in a school setting where he must work with parents, teachers, administrators and representatives of the community. This objective deals only with student behavior.

C. Setting

The counselor was employed on a half-time basis between October and December of 1970. The questionnaire was administered during the last week that he worked at Northwood. Prior to the counselor's appointment at Northwood there had been another part time counselor the previous year. Although not easily categorized, her approach to counseling was somewhat different from this counselor's point of view.

One of the primary objectives of this counselor during the first part of the school year was to educate the students and faculty about counseling and to help develop approach behavior towards it. A good deal of the counselor's time was spent with large groups in discussing various developmental problems that the students might have.

D. Instrumentation

The Student Attitude Questionnaire was developed by the counselor for whom it was used to evaluate. The items were written in an attempt at testing his behavioral objectives.

IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA - TOTAL POPULATION

A. Description of Scoring

The questionnaire consisted of three types of questions: (a) identification; (b) awareness to counseling, and (c) responding to counseling. The identification items were included so as to make it possible to ascertain whether any sub populations felt differently towards counseling than the total population. It ultimately proved quite beneficial. Using intuitive logic, if a student is both aware of and responds to counseling he will also value counseling. It is quite difficult to evaluate valuing without identifying awareness and responding.

The results are reported in percentage of responses based on the frequency distribution for the entire population. The results appear in three columns. The column of the left, unless indicated otherwise, represents an approach response or an accurate perception of counseling. The middle column represents avoidance or inaccurate responses. Those percentages reported in the third column, unless indicated otherwise, represent students who answered the particular question for the most part, had their responses tallied in the third category, i.e., "I don't know."

Identification

1. Sex: Boys: 99 Girls: 120 Total - N - 219

2. Grade and Section:

6th grade N-68 7th grade N=71 8th grade 80 Total N=219

24. THE GUIDANCE COUNSELOR HAS CALLED ME DOWN TO HIS OFFICE BECAUSE I

Grades	Behavior-personality misc. problem	Never there
56.6%	5.9%	37.4%

30. ON THE LAST GRADING PERIOD I GOT:

"Unsats"	"Honor Roll"	Neither (Circle one)
43.4%	19.2%	33.8%

According to the combined responses in item 24, 62.5% of the students stated that they saw the counselor. The counselor tried to see all students who either received unsats or made the honor roll. Item 30 indicates that 62.6% received marks which would qualify them under this criterion.

31. I FOUND READING THESE QUESTIONS:

Easy	Hard	Just right
36.5	11.0	47.0

Item 31 deals with level of reading difficulty. The vocabulary was pre-tested with a class of 6th graders. In retrospect this was crucial. Of all the words dictated, the one which they had difficulty recognizing was "counselor." Even when printed on the blackboard many did not recognize it, although it was part of their auditory vocabulary. The counselor then printed "guidance counselor" on the board and more students recognized it, but still a few didn't. The directions for administering were subsequently changed to provide for the test administrator to both pronounce and print the words "guidance counselor" on the board.

The data reported for item 31 would suggest that the test proved to be within the independent reading level of 83.5% of the student body. From spot checking of the questionnaires, there was no observable pattern between grade level and difficulty in reading the instrument. Item 31 was not analyzed by the computer according to grade level.

6. Responses to Counseling

13. WHERE IS THE GUIDANCE COUNSELOR'S OFFICE LOCATED?

94.1 .05 | 4.6

Ninety-four percent of the students knew where the office was located. This particular office had been used the previous year as a counseling office. Prior to that it was used by the nurse.

14. WHAT IS IT LIKE INSIDE?

36.5 6.4 56.6

The responses to item 14 needs some interpretation. Firstly, the office was decorated with children's art work including a 12' long - 3 foot wide painting fashioned after Jackson Pollack's style. Mobiles hung from the ceiling. All this art work was visible from the hallway. The office suite consisted of two offices. One was ostensibly used as waiting room which had chairs and all of the art work. The inner office had a desk and two chairs and was somewhat more formal. Frequently the counselor used the outside room to talk to individuals and it was used exclusively when groups came down. Some students in the 8th grade felt that the mural was "ugly" or "babyish." Generally the comments were favorable. However, over 6% of the students objected to the highly decorated office.

15. WHAT IS THE GUIDANCE COUNSELOR'S NAME?

(Don't worry about spelling)

92.7 .5 6.8

One of the highest items in terms of level of awareness was to the counselor's name (92.7%). This item was scored regardless of spelling. If there was a resemblance to his name, it was scored correct.

18. WHERE, BESIDES THE COUNSELOR'S OFFICE, HAVE YOU SEEN THE COUNSELOR?

29.4 .9 12.3

Item 18 was concerned with whether the students noticed that the counselor was more frequently out of his office or in it. A correct or approach response was indicated if the student listed any specific place in the school besides the main office. The .9% represents those who responded to seeing the counselor either in his office, or not. Over twelve percent didn't know or left the space blank.

19. THE GUIDANCE COUNSELOR SEES BOYS AND GIRLS FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS.

50.0 .9 10.0

Students whose responses were scored "accurate" listed answers like: school work, personal problems, unsats, problems with a teacher, honor roll, etc. If a student responded: "to get yelled at" or "to get punished" it was scored as inaccurate. Ten percent didn't know why students would see the counselor.

20. WHAT HAPPENS WHEN A STUDENT SEES THE GUIDANCE COUNSELOR?

56.6 13.2 29.7

Although less than 1% of the students gave inaccurate information about why a student would see a counselor, 13.2% showed apprehension about seeing him. More students knew why a child may see the counselor than what happened to the child who saw the counselor. As indicated in item 24, 62.5% of the students admitted to seeing the counselor. Only 56.6 of the students in the school associated approach behavior with the counselor. It is also interesting to note that 13.2% of the students displayed avoidance behavior towards seeing the counselor. This might indicate that the students perceptions were (a) accurate and they had reason to be apprehensive or (b) inaccurate and the counselor should work on changing their attitudes through personal contact. The 29.7% level of "I don't know" is one of the highest reported in this study. This would indicate that more children should be exposed to a counseling interview if the objectives are to reduce anxiety associated with being called down to the counselor's office.

23. TO GET AN APPOINTMENT TO SEE THE COUNSELOR, YOU:

83.7

3.7

29.2

This item tested whether or not the children remembered how to get an appointment. Every class in the school was visited by the counselor and simple directions were given out. Except for the fact that the counselor worked alternate days, it was rather easy to get permission to see him. The teachers were generally very cooperative and receptive.

25. WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE GUIDANCE COUNSELOR AND THE PRINCIPAL?

83.1%

2.3%

14.2%

The counselor made it quite clear to the students that under no circumstances would he "paddle" them. The boys were at first remissive. The principal was known for hitting the children. This item was designed to see whether the students associated counseling or non-beating with the counselor and punishment and discipline with the principal. Eighty-three percent of the students were accurate in their perceptions of the difference.

26. WHAT KIND OF INFORMATION DOES THE COUNSELOR GIVE OUT?

This item, although included in the questionnaire was omitted during the scoring since the writer was unable to come up with a preferred response as opposed to one which indicated either avoidance or inaccuracy.

D. Responding3. DO I LIKE THE GUIDANCE COUNSELOR?

74.9%

5.5%

19.2%

Three-fourths of the students stated that they liked the counselor. Although it is undesirable, one must recognize the fact that there would be some students who don't (5.5%). It would be interesting to know what characteristics these 5.5% display in terms of academic achievement and social success. The 19.2% of the students who stated that did not know represent an even more interesting group. One must wonder if the counselor had been in the building on a full time basis would this group have divided itself among the other two. The 74.9% response can be interpreted as a display of approach behavior towards the counselor.

4. IS THE GUIDANCE COUNSELOR BOSSY? ("No" = approach response)

83.6%

3.2%

13.2%

This question was scored in its reverse, i.e., those students who stated that the counselor was not bossy were given an approach rating.

7. DOES THE GUIDANCE COUNSELOR GIVE LECTURES?

51.6%

20.5%

26.5%

This question was scored the same as item 4 above. The results though are quite different. This has one of the highest ratings of avoidance behavior and indicates that twenty percent of the students found the counselor prone to give lectures. This might have occurred because of the large number of students who were instructed to come by the principal to discuss their unsats. In any case, the figure is too high.

5. IS THE GUIDANCE COUNSELOR FRIENDLY?

88.6%

3.2%

7.3%

Eighty-eight percent of the students felt that the counselor was friendly. Is it possible that the students accepted the fact that the counselor, as far as they were concerned, "gave lectures" while still perceiving him as friendly? To this item only 7.3% of the students were unable to respond. Compare this to the following item.

6. DOES THE GUIDANCE COUNSELOR LIKE ME?

21.0%

2.7%

75.8%

The response to this item is difficult to evaluate. Three fourths of the students didn't know if the counselor liked them or not. In comparison to other questions, the 75.8% represented a high score. On the other hand the frequency of responses under the category of "no" is low in comparison to responses to other questions. The 21.0% represents a total of 46 students who felt that the counselor liked them. Why did so few students feel that the counselor liked them? Or, why did so many not know? (see page 15 for a detailed analysis of those students comprising the 21%).

8. DOES THE GUIDANCE COUNSELOR UNDERSTAND ME?

38.4%

5.9%

54.8%

Fifty-four percent of the students were unable to respond to this item. The percentage of students expressing avoidance behavior is nominal. A little more than half of the students who stated that they saw the counselor reported that he understood them. There is no doubt that the 38.4% response is extremely low in relation to the other scores.

9. IS THE GUIDANCE COUNSELOR PATIENT?

68.9%

4.1%

24.2%

This is one category where the students' perception of the counselor differed from his perception of himself. The students found the counselor more patient than he felt he was.

A relatively high percentage of students who were unable to respond. Four percent of the students felt that the counselor was not patient. The counselor would have predicted that this figure would have been higher.

10. CAN THE GUIDANCE COUNSELOR HELP BOYS AND GIRLS?

78.5%

2.7%

16.0%

Item 10 tried to see whether the students had confidence in the counselor. Although over three-quarters felt that the counselor could help, there still remained a reasonable percentage of students who did not know (16%). In a school with a full time counselor, the category of "I don't know" might see a reduction over the school year.

11. DOES THE GUIDANCE COUNSELOR CARE ABOUT HOW I'M GETTING ALONG?

68.0%

3.2%

27.9%

12. DOES THE GUIDANCE COUNSELOR LIKE BOYS AND GIRLS?

68.0%

.09%

28.8%

Items 11 and 12 were used somewhat like a projective device inviting the students to state how they thought the counselor felt. The results for both items were highly similar. Unfortunately, a little over a quarter of the students were unable to respond. One must wonder how these students differ from those who felt that the counselor did care.

21. IF I HAD A SERIOUS PROBLEM THAT HAD TO DO WITH SCHOOL, THE FIRST PERSON I WOULD TALK TO WOULD BE:

Counselor	Teacher	Other
69.9%	10.5%	19.6%

22. IF I HAD A SERIOUS PERSONAL PROBLEM, WHO WOULD I TELL FIRST?

Counselor	Teacher	Other
42.9%	8.7%	48.4%

Items 21 and 22 were not scored according to "approach", "avoidance" and "I don't know". If a student listed the counselor in any of the three blank spaces for each question it was scored "counselor". If the student listed a teacher (and not the counselor) it was scored "teacher." Parents and friends fell into the third category. In many instances all three were mentioned, and as long as the word counselor (or his name) appear it was scored "counselor." The same held true for "teacher." In some instances the counselor was not mentioned but the teacher and parents were. That was scored as "teacher." It is obvious from the data that the students were more inclined to see the counselor for school related problems than personal problems. This may be reflection of the traditional values of the community and that the child is encouraged not to bring their personal problems to school or out of the house! On the other hand it may mean that the children feel more confident about talking with school personnel about school related problems than personal problems. To a degree this is realistic. Other than listening, the school personnel, including the counselor, are frequently unable to change the child's outside world. Certainly the counselor can help a child accept and adjust to the complexities of his world but students may show a greater pragmatism than we expect. Unfortunately some children chose not to respond to this item and this was recorded in the "other" column. This may have been an error.

17. THE BEST THING ABOUT OUR GUIDANCE COUNSELOR IS?

85.8%	2.3%	11.9%
-------	------	-------

18. THE WORST THING ABOUT OUR GUIDANCE COUNSELOR IS?

22.8%	21.5%	55.7%
-------	-------	-------

The two items above rendered open ended responses which were largely difficult to categorize. The items were included so that students could express their judgements about the counselor. To qualify for an approach response in item 17 the student had to make an accurate statement. If a student said "He get's us out of class" that would be scored an avoidance since the counselor did not feel that the job was to facilitate students' missing class for the sake

of missing class. Many students wrote "he is nice" and "he is fun to talk with." Item 18 is somewhat different. This question asks the students to be critical in a negative sense. If a student said "nothing" or "he should stay the way he is" it would be scored as approach. A number of students wrote "his overglasses" "his moustache" or "his clothing" these were placed in the "I don't know" column because they were not considered to be accurate responses. For an item to be scored as avoidance, the student would write "he is bossy" or "he doesn't mind his own business." These two items do not lend themselves to machine scoring and are best interpreted from the raw data provided on the original questionnaire.

26. I THINK THE GUIDANCE COUNSELOR SHOULD? COULD?

38.8%

12.3%

47.9%

Item 26 is quite similar to items 17 and 18 in that it was eliciting from the students an open ended response. It was scored accordingly. Thirty-eight percent of the responses were identified as approach. These responses were similar to: "continue what he is doing," "work at Northwood on a full time basis," "see more students," and "come into our class and have more talks." For an answer to be identified as avoidance, responses would be like: "mind his own business," "leave the kids alone," or "stop thinking he knows it all." Unfortunately almost half of the students in the school did not respond to this item.

27. IF THE GUIDANCE COUNSELOR SENT FOR ME, I WOULD THINK?

63.0%

18.7%

18.3%

29. IF I HAD A YOUNGER BROTHER AND HE RECEIVED A NOTE FROM THE GUIDANCE COUNSELOR ASKING HIM TO COME DOWN TO HIS OFFICE ON THE NEXT DAY, WHAT WOULD I TELL ME BROTHER TO EXPECT?

54.3%

10.5%

34.2%

Items 27 and 29 were included in an attempt at seeing how the individual students felt about either being called down themselves or having a friend or relative called down. Whereas they might have responded in the affirmative sense on some of the earlier questions, these two required them to express how they would feel if they were in the situation or knew some one who was. It is interesting to note that 63.0% of the students showed approach behavior if they were sent for but were a bit more cautious (54.3%) if their brother was called down. However the avoidance responses were reversed in degree. Eighteen percent (18.7%) displayed avoidance reactions to

being called down themselves while they were less protective in expressed avoidance for their brothers (10.5%).

V. ANALYSIS OF DATA-SUB-POPULATION:

Only the responses tallied and a frequency distribution prepared but the data was subjected to analysis of variance. Theoretically this was incorrect since the population was not randomized and was not a sample of a larger population. The 219 students represent the total school population who completed the questionnaire on the day it was administered. However, the following sub-groups were compared in terms of their overall approach rating. This total score was calculated on the basis of 25 items of both the awareness and the response type. The identification items were omitted for the analysis of variance. Below is a list of all of the combinations which proved to have no important difference from the mean of the entire school.

1. According to sex
2. According to grade
3. According to grade and sex
4. According to nature of expressed problem for having seen counselor (grades, personal, not seen at all). The information for this was obtained from item 24.
5. According to grade and sex and type of problem
6. Section 7-3 compared to sections 7-1, 7-2 and 7-4
7. Section 7-3 compared to sections 7-1, 7-2 and 7-4 according to sex.

*Although 7-3 was not a control group per se, they did receive special attention in that they had a series of group discussions with the counselor which the other groups did not have. For this reason the counselor wanted to know if they felt any differently about counseling than the other seventh graders. They didn't.

There was the major surprise in the data which the counselor would not have predicted. On the basis of 25 approach responses, the mean for the entire population was 16.3* "correct" or "approach" responses.

TABLE THREE: DISTRIBUTION ACCORDING TO APPROACH RESPONSE BY ACADEMIC STATUS

	Mean approach responses*	% Responding in each category	Number responding in each category
Honor roll	18.38	19.2	44
Unsats	16.64	43.4	91
Neither	14.71	33.8	73

Those students who saw the counselor because they were on the honor roll felt more positively about the counselor than the other two groups. This could have been predicted. However, those students who saw the counselor because they received unsats viewed the counselor more favorably than those who never saw the counselor. The findings would indicate that the counselor should see as many children as possible. The data suggests that students who see the counselor, for whatever reason, view the counselor more positively than those who don't see him at all.

Because only 21% of the students gave approach responses to question six (Does the Guidance Counselor like me?) it was decided to compare the responses of this group (N=46) to the entire population (N=219). The difference in percentage points for each question is reported in the appendix. These students tended to demonstrate greater approach behavior than their peers in the total population. Except for four questions, their responses were all higher than the mean response for the total population. On the four questions which they were lower, (13, 16, 20, 21) the differences were 4 percentage points or less. These students from their responses on the four questions mentioned above indicated that they knew slightly less than their peers about counseling and would be somewhat less inclined to seek help from the counselor.

This can be easily explained since 19.2% of the total population reported seeing the counselor because they were on the honor roll and this group reported 37.0%. From inspecting the differences in scores, one can state that this sub group tended to do better in school, be more independent and view others and themselves more positively. On items 6, 8, 11 and 12 they scored considerably higher than the mean of the total population. These questions dealt with how they thought the counselor felt about students in general, themselves in particular and the counselor's ability to help and understand children.

2. LIMITATIONS OF DESIGN:

a. Analysis of the data and its scoring:

The students were instructed to write "don't know" if they couldn't complete any questions. Some of the identification items were left blank. This made analyzing the data according to sub groups difficult at times. It did not effect the frequency distribution of the total population.

The counselor has the "feeling" that had the data processing center been equipped to work with unsophisticated graduate students, the data could have been more thoroughly analyzed. For example, was there any relationship between those who had trouble reading the questionnaire (item 31) and the over-all approach score? There are several other relationships which could have been explored. However, in view of the results, it doesn't seem to be appropriate at this time.

The original questionnaires were hand scored and the results tabulated on IBM Forms. This transferring of information increased the likelihood of clerical errors.

b. Limitations of the instrument:

The instrument should have been pretested with a random sample of the school's population using an open-ended instrument. The results should have been tabulated and the 4 most frequent responses to each question should have been included in a multiple choice form of the same questionnaire. The students could have responded directly on the IBM sheets and considerable time could have been saved. One or two open-ended questions, though, should still be included in the final instrument.

Certain items of the questionnaire should be either deleted or rewritten. Item 26 ("What kind of Information does the Gc give out") seemed extra difficult to score since the nature of this counselor's particular job included very little information giving. Item 30 was intended to ascertain the academic success level of each student. However it was possible for a student to get an unsat and still make the honor roll. The question should be rewritten.

Those questions which elicited open-ended responses were especially difficult to score. The data may be helpful in understanding the kinds of things the students wanted from the counselor but it did not lend itself to computer analysis.

In its present form the instrument is too cumbersome to administer to secondary students and evaluate without the assistance of data processing equipment. Therefore, the answer sheet should lend itself to machine scoring.

This was the first time the instrument was administered so that there was not existing data. Had there been such data the results could have been compared and certain correlations computed.

The students answered on dittoed questionnaires. The responses were hand sorted by the counselor and the individual responses were then transferred to IBM 333 forms. Cards were punched the computer at the University of Toledo analyzed the data.

VII. IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Because there is no base line data it is impossible to make any statements concerning previous student attitudes. There are no norms against which to compare the findings. All that exists is a series of responses to 31 items. One can discuss the results in a relative sense ranking the items from the highest to the lowest in terms of the frequency of approach responses. For that matter the frequency of either avoidance or "don't know" responses can also be evaluated.

Although the open-ended responses do not appear within the text of this paper, reading through the students' comments can provide insight into how they have responded to the counseling program. One item stands out, the students felt they should have a counselor on a full time basis. Some seemed somewhat annoyed that they couldn't rely on the counselor's being in the building when they needed him. This problem was beyond the counselor's control.

Twenty percent of the students felt that the counselor gave lectures. Only 3.9% of the students saw the counselor for reasons other than grades. Almost 19% of the students would be apprehensive or scared if they were called down to the counselor's office. Ten and a half percent would tell their younger brother's to expect trouble if called down. These feelings are not conducive to an effective counseling program.

Specifically, the counselor met his objective of seeing virtually all the A- and B- students who either had unsats or made the honor roll. There is a basic question as to whether the counseling program met the needs of the student body by limiting itself to such a small group. The school administration imposed upon the counselor the responsibility of seeing those who received unsats. The counselor came to see all those who made the honor roll. However, only 5.9% reported that they saw the counselor for other reasons. In terms of evaluating the success of the entire program, one must wonder whether this 6% level is rather low. The counselor was in the school for a limited amount of time and possibly more children would have come to the counselor if circumstances had been different.

In the case, the counselor saw almost two-thirds of the students in the school for one reason or another. These statistics are self-reported. Do students who see the counselor for personal problems respond any differently than other students? Would they be less inclined to respond when asked? The writer of this paper tends to feel that the 66% figure is an accurate estimate of students seen for non-academic counseling.

One must remember that the counselor worked at this school for only three months and was on a half time schedule at that. For this reason, it is possible to take pleasure in the fact that he saw two thirds of his case load within that period. But individual counseling for personal problems suffered because of it.

In conclusion, the data would suggest that the students, for the most part displayed approach behavior towards counseling. They knew who he was and what he did. They knew where his office was and how to get an appointment. Seventy five percent of the students said that they liked him. Eighteen percent said they would be scared if they were sent for. The counseling program, at this particular school was in its infancy. Both the administration, the students and the counselor needed a greater opportunity to learn about each other and work together. The initial findings are encouraging. It is unfortunate that the counselor was unable to continue working at this school. There was a job to be done, the faculty and administration were supportive to counseling and the students were eager.

and Responses to Questions Dealing With Awareness and

	Level population (N=219)	Sub-population (N=46)	Difference between the two population
	87.9	87.0	+0.9
	86.6	83.5	+3.1
	85.3	83.5	+1.8
	84.0	100.0	-16.0
	82.6	63.9	+18.7
	81.3	69.6	+11.7
	80.9	76.2	+4.7
	79.5	61.3	+18.2
	78.0	59.2	+18.8
	73.0	51.3	+21.7
	70.1	60.3	+9.8
	69.5	43.5	+26.0
	62.1	55.7	+6.4
	59.4	52.6	+6.8
	53.8	57.8	-4.0
	51.8	32.6	+19.2
	49.0	49.1	-0.1
	53.6	52.2	+1.4
	49.9	65.2	-15.3
	42.9	45.7	-2.8
	66.7	67.4	-0.7
	63.1	89.1	-26.0
	63.0	65.0	-2.0
	33.8	43.5	-9.7
	54.3	56.5	-2.2

Question 35:

	Great	Honor Roll	Neither
Level population:	43.4%	19.2%	33.6%
Sub-population:	6.5%	37.0%	54.8%

Sub-population was based on those students who indicated an approach similar to item 6. They represent 21% of the entire school population.

Directions to the Student

1. This is not a test.
2. Do not put your name anywhere on the attached pages.
3. Please try to answer every question as honestly as possible.
4. Some questions will ask to choose between "yes" - "no" - "I don't know!"
5. Some questions will ask you to complete the sentence by filling in the blank space. Do not worry about spelling.
6. If you do not understand a question OR are unable to answer a question just draw a line through the answer space.
7. Take as long as you need to answer.
8. Remember, this is not a test. Do not place your name anywhere on the attached pages.
9. Your teacher is not permitted to help you except by explaining the directions.

Thank you.

DO NOT TURN THIS PAGE UNTIL YOU ARE TOLD TO.

2. The grade is _____ (6) _____ (7) _____ (8)

YES NO I DON'T KNOW

- | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| 3. Do I like the guidance counselor ? | | | |
| 4. Is the guidance counselor bossy ? | | | |
| 5. Is the guidance counselor friendly ? | | | |
| 6. Does the guidance counselor like me ? | | | |
| 7. Does the guidance counselor give lectures ? | | | |
| 8. Does the guidance counselor understand me ? | | | |
| 9. Is the guidance counselor patient ? | | | |
| 10. Can the guidance counselor help boys and girls ? | | | |
| 11. Does the guidance counselor care about how I'm getting along ? | | | |
| 12. Does the guidance counselor like boys and girls ? | | | |

13. Where is the guidance counselor's office located ? _____

14. What is it like inside ? _____

15. What is the guidance counselor's name ? _____
(Don't worry about spelling)

16. Where, besides the counselor's office, have you seen the counselor ?

A. _____ B. _____ C. _____

17. The best thing about our Guidance counselor is ? _____

18. The worst thing about our guidance counselor is ? _____

19. The guidance counselor sees boys and girls for the following reasons -

A. _____ B. _____ C. _____